



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

company one thinks little of many attainments that on the "physical plane" would seem impossible. "Whatever can't be done in the physical can be done in the spiritual."

The new mysticism, very prevalent at this time in America, is thus, indeed, not ill represented by this very pleasant book. Critical thinking there is none, of course, from one end of the volume to the other. There is the simple assumption that this is what any philosophical Idealism must come to,—an assumption that the present reviewer has several times dealt with at some length in the course of discussions on Idealism. As a fact, this gentle optimism, with its well known opposition of "lower plane" and "higher plane," of the "physical plane" and the "invisible," becomes often rather painfully dualistic at the very point where a sound idealism, facing the problem of evil with a true sense of its gravity, is most needed to give a practical unity to the concrete life and warfare of humanity. The new mysticism, like the old, is selective, and appeals only to a portion of mankind; but the old mysticism—the doctrine of the Hindoo forest sages, of the mediæval mystics, or even of our own earlier Transcendentalists—had an historical background, an energy of life, and an originality of expression and of experience that one has almost wholly to miss in our recent disciples of mental therapeutics, and of the "higher plane." The new doctrine saves its invalids, and has already given us a few really valuable contributions both to poetical literature and to the literature of direct personal experience; but it has yet to produce its "prophets."

JOSIAH ROYCE.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

THE DYNAMICS OF RELIGION. An Essay in English Culture History. By M. W. Wiseman. London: The University Press, Limited, 1897. Pp. 340

This book is an attempt to criticise the movement of theological thought in England since the Reformation from the atheistical stand-point. According to the writer, religion is a disease, priests are impostors, and the "main forces in the making and unmaking of churches are those of personal and pecuniary interests." At the end of the eighteenth century these conceptions of religion and ecclesiastical institutions had a certain vogue; but it is rather remarkable to find them dug out of their graves towards the close of the nineteenth to serve as an explanation of the dynamics of reli-

gion. "The fortunes of religion," says Mr. Wiseman, "are determined by ignorance, by avarice, by self-interest, by fashion, by carnal organization, by anything rather than reason, argument, conviction, or good faith." Mr. Wiseman's powers of denunciation are not confined to belaboring religious institutions: wherever he sees a head he cannot resist the temptation of hitting it, no matter whose head it happens to be. He tells us that Newton and Locke were guilty of dissimulation, that Berkeley was a hypochondriac, that Mr. Morley and Mr. Lecky lack logic and coherence, and that Mr. Morley's rationalist propaganda has been damped down by the indirect pressure of personal interest among other things. Mill's final leanings to theism were probably due to "a contraction of the understanding or shrinkage of the spirit with growing age." Mr. Leslie Stephen's attitude towards rationalism is "intelligible only as either a survival of early prejudice in a critic trained for the Church or an apprehensive propitiation of the orthodox reader." The last thing which Mr. Wiseman is prepared to concede to a man or an institution is a certain measure of sincerity and good faith. In fact, he opens his book with the assertion that man is a liar, and his criticism of men and movements in England during the last three hundred years is dominated by this belief.

It seems impossible for a writer with an ethical outlook of this character to do justice to any individual or any institution. The judgment is warped as effectively by a suspicious and cynical temper as by credulity and superstition. It is to be regretted on many grounds that Mr. Wiseman has approached his subject in such an unfortunate frame of mind. He has plenty of literary ability, and a considerable amount of knowledge. But these gifts are to a large extent spoilt by an aggressiveness, a cocksureness, and a supercilious acerbity towards all manner of men and things. Men win acceptance for their ideas as much by the ethical temper in which they are expressed as by the intrinsic power of the ideas themselves. It is rather curious that a writer of so much ability as Mr. Wiseman should at this time of day assume religion to be little else than a form of mental disease, concocted and kept alive by priests. No doubt history shows that priesthoods have not always been the friends of religion and that religious beliefs have been sometimes exploited by them for selfish purposes. It is not an unknown thing for mothers to starve or even murder their children, but these unnatural acts do not force us to the conclusion that the

maternal sentiment is an exploded superstition. The misdeeds of priests are a scandal to religion but not an argument against it. Besides, religions have existed in which, as far as can be discovered, there were no priests. How does this fact fit in with the view that religion is a priestly imposture? If religion is an imposture, it is remarkable that it should have existed so long. We find it in every stage of human history; among the most backward as well as among the most progressive races. Surely, if this great element in human life and conduct were of the spurious character which the writer of this book assumes it to be, some nations at some period of their history would have abandoned it. But it is useless arguing against positions which have been abandoned long ago by almost all serious students of religious history. In spite of much acute criticism on the theological controversies of the last three hundred years, Mr. Wiseman's general estimate of things ecclesiastical is of the same character as an anarchist's estimate of the existing order of society. Hitherto the doctrine of universal destruction, whether in the religious or the political sphere, has not appealed to the common sense of mankind, and there is no likelihood that it ever will.

W. D. MORRISON.

LONDON.

**AFFIRMATIONS.** By Havelock Ellis. London: Walter Scott, 1898.

This book has borrowed its title from Friedrich Nietzsche's writings, and, without any doubt, it will be mainly read for the essay on that German philosopher which fills the first eighty-five pages of it. Whatever follows them—essays on Casanova, Zola, Huysmans, and St. Francis and others—is of comparatively minor importance. Mr. Ellis is one of the few Englishmen who really feel the greatness of Nietzsche's intellectual achievements. For him Nietzsche stands in the first rank of the distinguished and significant personalities our century has produced, and he has too generous a turn of mind to condemn Nietzsche's philosophy because Nietzsche's life ended in insanity. "No doubt it was once a consolation to many that Socrates was poisoned, that Jesus was crucified, that Bruno was burnt. But hemlock and the cross and the stake proved sorry weapons against the might of ideas even in those days, and there is no reason to suppose that a doctor's certificate will be more effectual in our own," are his own words. They express an attitude towards the subject very different from that taken up by almost the entire English criticism ever since Nietzsche's writings